‘FORERUNNERS’ OF MAQLÛ
A NEW MAQLÛ–RELATED FRAGMENT FROM ASSUR

Daniel Schwemer

ALL MANUSCRIPTS of the series Maqlû known so far date to the first millennium BCE.¹ Thus the exact date of the redaction of the canonical text is difficult to determine and the study of Maqlû’s redactional history has to rely almost exclusively on the scrutiny of the canonical text’s wording and on the analysis of the (few) significant variants between its manuscripts that show that differing recensions of the text still circulated in the first millennium. Our knowledge of the structure, development, and textual growth of Maqlû is largely owed to Professor Tzvi Abusch’s seminal


¹. Within the framework of our collaboration on a comprehensive edition of Babylonian anti-witchcraft rituals and, more specifically, during the work on a new German translation of Maqlû, Tzvi Abusch generously gave me unlimited access to his synoptic edition of the Akkadian text. Any quotations
studies on the text, the most important of which are now conveniently assembled in his *Mesopotamian Witchcraft*. But, perhaps more importantly, it was he who, guided by the conviction that apparent incongruities and discrepancies in a text must not be dismissed as typical characteristics of “irrational” magical texts, very much introduced and developed the study of the redactional history of Akkadian incantations and rituals within a field that was, at the time, to a large extent oblivious to this notion.

Because of his interest in the redactional history of *Maqlû* Tzvi always paid special attention to texts closely related to *Maqlû*, to *Maqlû* incantations transmitted outside the series, and to *Maqlû* “manuscripts” that deviated from the main textual tradition. It is a pleasure to edit one modest new piece of evidence for the usage of *Maqlû* incantations outside the canonical series in a volume in honor of the scholar who first drew our attention to the existence and significance of texts of this kind.

In the first main chapter of his dissertation Abusch discusses the relationship of *Maqlû* VII 119–46 to a number of closely related texts, some of them anti-witchcraft incantations, some not. He was able to identify the extremely fragmentary passage KAR 269 rev. 1’–13’ as one of these parallels and concluded that “KAR 269 rev. is part of an inde-pendent Assur collection or complex ritual parallel or antecedent to the standard complex ritual *Maqlû*.“ He included in his discussion KAR 226, another Assur fragment containing an incantation otherwise known from *Maqlû*, and stressed that “one should study” KAR 269 “in conjunction with KAR..." from *Maqlû* in the following rely on this edition (and my own collation of the cuneiform sources); references to *Maqlû* follow the line count in Abusch and Schwemer, “Das Abwehrzauber-Ritual Maqlû (=Verbrennung),” in *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testamentes. Neue Folge*, ed. B. Janowski and G. Wilhelm (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2008), 4:91–149.


Both statements have lost nothing of their validity, but the group of Maqlû-related Assur texts has been expanded in the meantime and, while it is unfortunately still unclear how the fragments are interrelated textually, we now know that all of them date earlier than the bulk of seventh-century Neo-Assyrian Assur texts; all but one should be dated to the later Middle Assyrian period. I include in the following overview of the relevant fragments also KAR 226 and 269:


Fragment of a large, three-column tablet with a white slip, inscribed in an elegant Middle Assyrian hand; signs are set closely together, spaces are filled with “firing” holes.

The tablet originally comprised between 400 and 500 lines. From what is preserved in obv. I–II and rev. V–VI one can safely conclude that the tablet contained exclusively anti-witchcraft incantations accompanied by rubrics that included brief ritual instructions. Six of what may have been twenty to thirty incantations are partially preserved, but for only three a substantial portion of text has survived. Obv. II 4’–15’ can confidently be restored as almost identical to Kaššāptu nērtānitu in Maqlû III 39–60. Obv. I 4’–17’ (well preserved, but incomplete) and rev. VI 3–13 (fragmentary) are without duplicates, but since the latter text is largely composed of formulaic material known from other incantations it can be safely restored.

4. BWIL, 77. Transliterations of both fragments based on E. Ebeling’s copies were given in the volume: KAR 269: pp. 17–18, 80–82; KAR 226: pp. 11–12, 78–80.

5. The transition between the Middle Assyrian and early Neo-Assyrian library hands is still little understood; a systematic paleographic study of the library tablets from Assur has never been undertaken.

6. Cf. already my brief remarks in Abwehrzauber und Behexung, 43–44.


8. See Abusch, BWIL, 11–12; Abusch’s basic reconstruction of the text is confirmed by collation: (5)EN ak-tab-sa-ak[a šaddakka bina] (6)căš el-la (7)[nu:šlibbi gisimmari] (8)in-šu ia ta-ni-ta-ia ta-[di-ra-ta ia xxx x (s)] (9)lu-
It remains unclear whether the tablet contained a collection of texts or one extensive anti-witchcraft ritual.

VAT 10786: Copy: fig. 1–2; edition: the fragment was identified as Maqlû-related by S. M. Maul; he entrusted the fragment to me for publication in the series KAL and kindly consented to a publication and discussion of the text within the framework of this article.9

Fragment of a small, probably single-column tablet (74 x 51 x 21 mm); the script suggests an early Neo-Assyrian (or possibly still Middle Assyrian?) date. It should be noted that the main characteristics of the ductus, which clearly differs from that typical for the seventh-century Assur literary texts ($\beta$A with oblique wedges, $\tilde{t}$I-type signs with four small wedges, $\nu$A with three horizontal wedges, $\tilde{\nu}$U written with almost horizontal wedges, $\tilde{\nu}$U still with slightly oblique wedges), can be found also on a number of tablets from the eighth to seventh-century library of the Nabû temple in Nimrud and was interpreted by the editors as “features of … the Kalû literary hand, which was perhaps more conservative than that of Nineveh” (see CTN 4, p. 6).

The format of the tablet is reminiscent of small “ritual memoranda” like K 88810 and KAL 2, 31 and, indeed, with possibly one exception the text gives only the incipits of incantations accompanied by rubrics and very succinct ritual instructions. The number of incantations to be recited is, however, much higher than in the “ritual memoranda” and lends the text some similarity with the ritual tablets of extensive rituals such as Maqlû and Šurpu.

9. I would like to thank Prof. B. Salje, director of the Vorderasiatische Museum, for the permission to publish the fragment.
It seems likely that the tablet did not just contain a collection of incantation incipits for similar individual rituals, but actually represents one coherent ritual. Despite the fragmentary state of the text the basic structure of the ritual may still be recognized: the destruction of substitute figurines is followed by purifying washing rites and apotropaic fumigations. A number of the incantations quoted in VAT 10786 form part of Maqlû; a few are named in the same or a similar sequence as in Maqlû (see the notes on the text for further details).

VAT 10933: Copies: E. Ebeling, KAR 240; Schwemer, in KAL 4 (forthcoming); editions: the source is incorporated in Meier’s edition of Maqlû; Schwemer, in KAL 4 (transliteration, translation, notes).

Fragment of a Middle Assyrian tablet; the large, widely spaced script is strikingly similar to that of VAT 10938 (infra), but a physical (“direct”) join between the two fragments is excluded.

The preserved text duplicates Maqlû II 29–46 with a number of significant variants that indicate that the fragment does not stem from a manuscript of canonical Maqlû:11 iniya dągilatti instead of Maqlû’s iniya nāṭilati (l. 5’ = Maqlû II 33); berkya lāsimāti instead of Maqlû’s berkya ebbirēti (l. 6’ = Maqlû II 35); addition of l. 7’; addition of uṣēpiš at the end of l. 9’ (= Maqlû II 38); finally: l. 11’ is a combination of Maqlû II 40 and 42; ll. 40, second half, 41 and 42, first half, are missing.12

VAT 10938: Copy: R. Strauss, in KAL 4 (forthcoming); editions: The text was identified by Abusch among the Geers’ copies; earlier versions of his synoptic edition included the fragment among the sources of Maqlû V, but because of

---

11. This was first observed by Abusch, who therefore excluded the fragment from his synoptic edition of the Akkadian text of Maqlû.

its deviation from the standard text Abusch excluded it from the final version; S. M. Maul and R. Strauss, in KAL 4 (transliteration, translation, notes).13

Small fragment of a Middle Assyrian tablet; the script is strikingly similar to that of VAT 10938 (supra), but a physical (“direct”) join between the two fragments is excluded.

Obv. 1’–5’ duplicate Maqlû V 15–18 (with a variant or slight corruption in l. 3’), rev. 1’–3’ offer the end of an otherwise unknown anti-witchcraft incantation; this is followed by a variant version of Isâ isâ (rev. 4’–8’ = Maqlû V 158ff.).

VAT 11119: Copies: E. Ebeling, KAR 269; Schwemer, in KAL 4 (forthcoming); editions: Abusch, BWiL, 17–18, 80–82 (transliteration, discussion); Schwemer, in KAL 4 (transliteration, translation, notes). Fragment of a two-column, middle-sized Middle Assyrian tablet. The signs are comparatively large and widely spaced; double and single rulings are used without any clear difference in function. Abusch, BWiL, 77, wondered whether KAR 226 and 269 could “form part of one sequence.” Given their very different shape, script, and layout this seems unlikely. The right-hand part of VAT 11119 (all in all four fragments) had been lost during the war, so that Abusch’s editio princeps had to be based on Ebeling’s copy only (see BWiL, xv–xvi). The missing fragments were retrieved by the present author during stays at the Vorderasiatische Museum in 2007 and 2008 among the unnumbered fragments of the collection. Abusch’s identifications of the texts preserved on the fragment14 are confirmed by the collation of the original,

13. I would like to thank S. M. Maul and R. Strauss for making their edition available to me before the publication of the volume.

though unsurprisingly his edition has to be revised in a number of places.  

Given the extremely fragmentary nature of all the relevant texts it is difficult to gauge their exact relationship to the canonical series *Maqlû*. Nevertheless it is possible to draw a few general conclusions:

(1) First of all, it must be stressed that Middle Assyrian fragments such as VAT 10933 (*KAR* 240), which offer passages duplicating *Maqlû* incantations (with a number of variants), do not provide evidence for a second-millennium date of the composition of the canonical *Maqlû* series. The bigger fragments show that incantations incorporated in *Maqlû* formed part of various anti-witchcraft rituals.  

(2) Especially VAT 9531 (*KAR* 226) and VAT 10786 suggest that *Maqlû* was neither the first nor the only extensive collection of anti-witchcraft rituals. If our assumption that VAT 10786 represents the “ritual tablet” of one coherent anti-witchcraft ritual is correct, we can also conclude that extensive anti-witchcraft rituals involving the recitation of many incantations co-existed with *Maqlû*; it seems very likely that such texts already existed before the canonical *Maqlû* was created. Like *Maqlû*, VAT 10786 prescribes the recitation of a number of incantations for the same ritual action, which is repeated several times. 

(3) Even a cursory comparison of the *Maqlû*-related passages in our text group with the versions of the text as found in the canonical

---

15. Especially on the reverse (?) where Ebeling in his—mostly reliable—copy did not indicate that the preserved signs belong to two columns. The column dividers are nowhere preserved; but the reconstruction of the text in rev. III, the physical shape of the tablet, and comparison with the location of the column dividers on the obverse (?) show clearly that the signs preserved at the beginning of Ebeling’s ll. 6’–8’ actually represent line endings of rev. IV (… [ri] x, … [x-e] … [x-li]).

16. For the usage of incantations known from *Maqlû* within other ritual contexts see Abusch, *MesWi*, 113–62, esp. 158–60, and Schwemer, *Abwehrauber und Behexung*, 37–55, esp. 43 with n. 67. Some of these texts are not specific anti-witchcraft incantations (e.g. *Aroḫḫīka ramāni* or *Šānum ellu šānum ebbu*); but it is clear that also specific anti-witchcraft incantations such as *Id ellu namru*, which had been integrated into *Maqlû*, were further transmitted outside the series in collections of *ušburruda* incantations.
series leaves no doubt that the incantations underwent a process of revision and change. The texts were often expanded, sometimes shortened, and whole passages were rearranged and combined in a different order.\textsuperscript{17} As Abusch has demonstrated many times, even in the absence of non-Maqlū parallels a close analysis of the canonical text and its sources can still reveal where and how incantations underwent such changes.

(4) Overall there are surprisingly few overlaps between the body of incantations that form part of the Maqlū ritual and the corpus of anti-witchcraft incantations transmitted outside Maqlū as single texts or as part of ušburruḍa collections.\textsuperscript{18} If one disregards incantations such as Araḫšika rumānī or Šamnu ellu šamnu ebbu, which are not directed against witchcraft specifically, the number is even further reduced. Of course, our knowledge of the body of anti-witchcraft incantations outside Maqlū is far from complete, but the overall picture seems too significant to be caused just by chance. Moreover, the Maqlū-related rituals or collections of incantations known from Assur all lack actual duplicates from other first-millennium libraries. It seems that these “forerunners” of Maqlū were not transmitted at all or were only rarely copied once the canonical Maqlū had been established. As with other works of Babylonian literature the canonical series eclipsed most of the older texts that were used and reworked in its creation, whereas incantations that had not been integrated into Maqlū continued to be transmitted individually or as part of other collections. On the other hand, one must not underestimate the

---

\textsuperscript{17} For an example of a shorter (i.e. shortened?) version in the canonical text cf. VAT 10933 (KAR 240) ll. 6–11’ // Maqlū II 36–42; for a rearrangement of whole passages cf. VAT 11119 (KAR 269) obv. II 4–8 = Maqlū VI 78–81, ibid. obv. II 9–13 = Maqlū VI 106–11; for a considerably expanded text in the canonical version cf. VAT 11119 rev. III 1–12 = Maqlū VII 114–40. Of course, the non-Maqlū version of an incantation does not present necessarily a more “original” or older version of the text; the relationship between the given versions must be discussed separately for each text.

\textsuperscript{18} The rubric ušburruḍa could be used with any type of anti-witchcraft incantation and, of course, is used also within Maqlū. The structure and contents of the extensive ušburruḍa series known from Ashurbanipal library tablets is still largely unknown (see Schwemer, Abwehrzauber und Behexung, 56–61, with earlier literature).
creativity of the anonymous redactor of Maqlû. It is very likely that the first five incantations of the series were newly composed for the canonical version of Maqlû,19 and the same may be true for other incantations as well where traditional Versatzstücke and new lines were combined into a new whole for which we cannot expect to find duplicates outside the received text.

(5) Among the first-millennium Maqlû manuscripts from Assur there are two sources that do not follow the canonical tablet division and seem to leave out whole portions of text, though within the individual incantations only minor variants to the canonical text and a number of Assyrianisms can be noted. The single-column tablet VAT 13642 (+) 13654 contains major parts of Maqlû III (l. 116′ to the end of the canonical tablet), then skips Maqlû IV 1–122 and continues with Maqlû IV 123–51, the last incantation of Maqlû IV and probably the last incantation on this tablet (the text breaks after l. 149). The fragment VAT 13672 has on the obverse a passage from Maqlû IV (ll. 80–95), while the reverse preserves a passage from Maqlû V (ll. 11–20).20 It seems that the tablet followed a format similar to VAT 13642(+), and, given that both manuscripts are similar with respect to tablet shape and script, one is tempted to assume that they both formed part of the same serialized sequence of tablets. All three fragments may well come from the same library, but only the provenance of VAT 13642 and VAT 13654, which were both found in the Neo-Assyrian library ‘N6’, can be reconstructed from the archaeological records.21 If the two

---

19. For the opening section of Maqlû see Abusch, BWiL, 85–147 (I 1–36) and, for I 37–72, idem, MesWi, 219–247 (= Studies Jacobsen, 2002), 249–269 (= Studies Greenfield, 1995); for a different interpretation see Schwemer, Abwehrzauber und Behexung, 38–40, 203–205, and, in more detail, my “Empowering the Patient: The Opening Section of the Ritual Maqlû” (paper read at the 54th Rencontre Assyrologique Internationale, Würzburg 2008, publication in preparation).

20. For a copy and annotated edition of the three fragments that had already been incorporated into Meier’s edition of Maqlû see now KAL 2, nos. 4–5 and 6.

21. See O. Pedersén, Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur, Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 8 (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1986), 2:82. Note that also VAT 10009 (KAR 235, new copy and annotated edition by the present author to be published in KAL 4), a Neo-Assyrian copy of Maqlû II on a small tablet in a minute script, belonged to this library.
sources really were part of one single sequence of tablets, this series would represent some kind of short version of Maqlû that did not only omit a number of incantations, but also arranged some of them in a different order compared to the canonical text.22 However, the two most important questions that arise from a study of these two sources must remain without a definitive answer for the time being: (1) Is the form of Maqlû represented by VAT 13642(+) and VAT 13672 a version that had been derived from the canonical text or should it rather be understood as one of possibly a number of precursors of canonical Maqlû? (2) Is there any link of transmission between the mostly Middle Assyrian Maqlû-related texts from Assur and these two first-millennium deviant Maqlû sources from the same city? The fact that the wording and the order of the incantations in VAT 13642(+) and VAT 13672 are comparatively close to the canonical text is more easily reconciled with the assumption of a shortened version dependent on the canonical text. At the same time there are no clear textual overlaps between the Middle Assyrian Maqlû-related texts and the deviant first-millennium sources. Furthermore, the peculiar use of a number of “Babylonian” sign-forms next to the corresponding Neo-Assyrian signs in VAT 13642(+)23 suggests that the two deviant Assur Maqlû sources were copied from Babylonian originals and thus did not depend on a local tradition stretching back to the Middle Assyrian period.24

(6) Finally, it should be emphasized that the few fragments of late-second-millennium Maqlû-related sources offer only a glimpse of what must have been a varied and unstable tradition. It is especially disheartening that only about ten percent of the original text

22. The single tablets of such a short series may well have been designated as nisû in Assur; the existence of nisû tablets in the libraries of Neo-Assyrian Assur is clearly attested for the uûurrudu rituals and other genres (see the discussion of KAL 2, 14 u.e. 19’ in Schwemer, Abwehrzauber und Behexung, 61).

23. Cf. the forms of łu, łu, łu and cû; see my comments in KAL 2, p. 9.

24. Of course, this does not imply that the seventh-century scribes of Assur did not copy Middle Assyrian originals. The spelling conventions found in the Neo-Assyrian tablet KAL 2, 23 (LKA 156) suggest, for example, that this manuscript is a faithful copy of a Middle Assyrian original; very possibly fragments of this original were found at Assur: KAL 2, 22 = BAM 334 + VAT 10094.
is preserved on fragments such as VAT 9531 (KAR 226). Fully preserved, these sources could provide key insights into the various traditions that became part of the canonical text of Maqlû. Also, they would shed light on the question of the degree to which the final text in its different recensions was the result of numerous redactions and textual growth at various stages and the degree to which the received text of Maqlû is owed to the organizing hand, creative mind, and scholarly authority of one single redactor, compiler, and composer.

In view of the dates of the extant manuscripts of the canonical text (in its different recensions) and the absence of Maqlû sources from the second-millennium libraries in Syria, Palestine, and Anatolia, Abusch tentatively concluded that “the present form of Maqlû seems to be a first millennium creation.” Given the general tendencies in the development of Babylonian literature, a slightly earlier date, in the thirteenth or, perhaps more likely, in the twelfth to eleventh centuries, seems more plausible to me. Since the dates of the extant manuscripts can provide only a terminus post quem, but not a terminus ante quem non, for the composition and since a linguistic analysis of a Standard Babylonian text that contains much traditional textual material will hardly yield unambiguous evidence for the date when a certain stability of the received text had been established and a canonical text under the title Maqlû began to circulate in its various recensions, external evidence for the date of the composition becomes especially valuable.

In view of a recent edition of the so-called “Exorcist’s Manual” or “catalogue of the šipu’s lore” a brief discussion of the inclusion of Maqlû in this text and its possible implications for the date of the composition is called for.

Maqlû is named within the first section of the “Exorcist’s Manual.” In her new edition of text C, Jean takes the rubric in KAR 44 rev. 4 // as


26. In the traditional view of the development of Akkadian literature, both Šurpu and Maqlû are seen as creations of the Middle Babylonian period; see, e.g., W. von Soden, “Das Problem der zeitlichen Einordnung akkadischer Literaturwerke,” MDOG 85 (1953): 14–26, esp. 24.
relating to the preceding, first section of the text.\(^{27}\) This would imply that, according to Babylonian tradition, *Maqlû* had been incorporated by the eleventh-century scholar Esangil-kin-apli into the established set of exorcistic texts: \(\text{rêšû(SAG.MEš) iškâr(EŠ.Gâr)}\) \(\text{āšipûti(MÂŠ.MÂŠ-ti) šâ} \text{‘ê-sag-il-}
\text{kin(GIN)-apli(A)}\) “Titles of the series of exorcistic lore (established) by Esangil-kin-apli.”\(^{28}\) It seems, however, more likely that the rubric at the very beginning of the text, understood by Jean to be the title of the entire text, relates to the first section, whereas the Esangil-kin-apli rubric pertains to the second section of the text (\(\text{KAR} 44 \text{ rev. 5f.} / \)\), which would comprise Esangil-kin-apli’s special addition to the traditional lore\(^{29}\) enumerated in the first part of the text.\(^{30}\) Be that as it may, the text as a whole leaves one with the impression that Assyro-Babylonian scholarly tradition regarded *Maqlû* as a creation predating Esangil-kin-apli. This view is not contradicted by our evidence, though, admittedly, it cannot be


28. Thus KAR 44 rev. 4; the Babylonian duplicates Rm 717+, BM 55148+ and SpTU 5, 231 add a genealogy. The beginning of the line is broken off in BM 55148+; instead of the expected SAG.MEš, Rm 717+ has ŠUN.IN.GIN-ê (reading unclear to me), a reading E. von Weiher adopted for SpTU 5, 231 rev. 27, even though his copy suggests ‘SAG.MEš x KA’.

29. KAR 44 obv. 1: \(\text{rêšû(SAG.MEš) iškâr(EŠ.Gâr)}\) \(\text{āšipûti(MÂŠ.MÂŠ-ti) šâ} \text{‘ê-} \text{na i} \text{êzû.(SIL.ZU)}\) u \(\text{lûmartî(KIL.DU}_{8}.î-A)\) \(\text{kin-nu} \text{napharu(tAR)} \text{šumšu(MU}_{3}.NE)\) “Titles of the series of exorcistic lore that have been established for instruction and study, a complete list.” Rm 717+ obv. 1 has \(\text{pîl(’KA)}\) ’DUB.SAG.MEš “wording of the titles” (for DUB.SAG “incipit”, “title”, see M. J. Geller, *Ur III Incantations from the Professor Hilprecht-Collection, Jena*, TMH 6 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003], 4–5). The beginning of SpTU 5, 231 obv. 1 is fragmentary, possibly it had just \(\text{KA DUB.SA} \text{c} \text{îškâr(EŠ.Gâr)}\).

proven to be accurate either, since unlike the ritual Šurpu, which was regarded as forming a complementary pair with Maqlú, manuscripts from the late second millennium have not (yet) been recovered.

APPENDIX
Edition of VAT 10786 (copy fig. 1 and 2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obv.</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[</td>
<td>ṣa'    ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[</td>
<td>ʾan ša' ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[</td>
<td>x [x] x [x] x x x x ʾan ʾ-šu' ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[x x ]</td>
<td>x x x x [x (x)] x x [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[x x a]l-ta-ma x [x] x [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>[EN lu]Š11 munus1š11 ʾe-pi-ši e1-[piš-ti]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>[EN AT-Š]tš11 munus1š11 ša te-š[u]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[KA.INIM].MA 'KIMIN1 1 NU ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>[EN x (x)] x <a href="-">x</a>š-tš-š[u] x x [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>[1 NU munus1Š11 šu(?)] NFG.SILA1,GÁ 'DŪ-ma' ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. E. Reiner, Šurpu: A Collection of Sumerian and Akkadian Incantations, AfO Beiheft 11 (Vienna 1958), 2–3, discusses the various texts that name Maqlú and Šurpu together (Bit rimki and the Bit rimki-related ritual PBS 1/1, 13, the “Exorcist’s Manual” and the commentary KAR 94). The main reason for combining the two rituals is that a “ban,” inflicted on the patient by the breaking of a taboo (Šurpu), and witchcraft, inflicted on the patient by other people (Maqlú), were regarded as two complementary sources of suffering, the first located within the patient himself or his immediate environment, the second outside the patient (see Schwemer, Abwehrzauber und Behexung, 66, 166, 195–96; add unpublished BM 42272 obv. 1–21 [30th pirsu of Šumma amelu muḫḫašu ummu ukal] to the texts quoted on p. 166 n. 151).

[EN x x (x)] ‘Kū kil’ x ma li’ x 

[KA.INIM.MA KIMI] N 1 NU mununU[S11

[EN (x) x x x-m]a e-l[i(-)

Obv.7 breaks; probably only a few lines missing to the lower edge.

rev.7 1’ [EN] ‘kiš-pu’ x x [
2’ [EN] x ba ‘ab’ (x) x x [
3’ [EN (x) x x DINGIR.KU.G]A.ME.EN ‘DINGIR.SIKIL..ME’ [EN]
4’ [EN at-tu-nu(??) lu]U[S11, MEŠ-IA e-pi-šu-‘ú’-[a]
5’ [EN (x) x x]-x-tu-nu gaš-ra-tu-nu ‘gap-ša’-[u-nu]
6’ [EN (x) x x x-m]a’-ia ta-di-ra-tu-[i[a]
7’ [EN x x]-x-at šu-ut-ti ba-na-a-a[t]
8’ [EN.MEŠ MEŠ(??)] ’a’-nu SULUH.A.KĀM

9’ [EN pu-ú id-bu]-ub lem-na-ti MIN im-[<ta->][l-li MIN’’]
10’ [KA.INIM.MA US11, BUR.R]U.LA.KĀM DŪ, DŪ.BI A.MEŠ an[a’ ID’]
11’ [x x x x] A.MEŠ KA-šib sāc-ma ana x [\n
12’ [EN a-kul(??) ]’i’id a-[l-ti : EN ’id ‘qa’-[aš-du (anāku)]
13’ [EN kib-rit DUMU.MUNUS] AN-e GAL ana-ku : EN kib-rit [kib-rit]
14’ [EN kib-rit(??)] ’DUMU.MUNUS’ dé-a gal-tu : ‘EN qa’’-

15’ [EN kib-rit e]-Ilu ku.KUR.KUR šam-m[u quddušu anāku]
16’ [x x x (x)] ’a’’-na kib-rit x [\n
17’ [EN x x x (x)] x x-ša-ku ana-ku [\n18’ [DŪ, DŪ.BI(??) ]’[m]GUR.GUR ’[N? , UŞ’\

19’ [EN [m]GUR.GUR-ma(??) ]’[m]’GUR.GUR(?)

Rev.7 breaks.

obv.7–5’ too fragmentary for translation

6’ [Wordling (of the incantation) to undo a ‘ban’: One figurine … ].

7’ [Incantation]: “My [war]lock, my witch, my sorcerer, [my] sor[ceress].”
8' [Wording (of the incantation)] to undo [witchcraft]: One [figurine of the warlock ... ].

9' [Incantation: “Yo]u, witch who have practise[d (sorcery) ... ].”]

10' [Wording (of the incantation) ditto33: One figurine [ ... ].]

11' [Incantation: “ ... ] kept seeking [ ... .” (Wording of the incantation to undo witchcraft)].

12' You make [one figurine of the witch of] dough. Then [ ... ].

13' [Incantation: “ ... ] [ ... ].”

14' [Wording (of the incantation) ditto34: One figurine of the witch ... ].

15' [Incantation: “ ... ] [ ... ].”

Obv.’ breaks; probably only a few lines missing to the lower edge.

rev.? 1' [Incantation: “ ... ], witchcraft [ ... ].”

2' [Incantation: “ ... ] [ ... ].”

3' [Incantation: “ ... ], you are a [pure] god, you are a sacred god.”

4' [Incantation: “You are my warlocks, [my] sorcerers.”

5' [Incantation: “( ... ) you are [ ... ], you are strong, you are numerous.”

6' [Incantation]: “My [ ... ], m[y] anxieties.”

7' [Incantation: “ ... ] is [ ... ], my dream is favorable.”

8' [These incantations are] for the hand-washing rite.

9' [Incantation: “The mouth spoke evil, ditto35 was full of ditto36.”]

10' [Wording (of the incantation) to undo [witchcraft]. Its ritual: [You ... ] water from the river].

33. = to undo witchcraft.

34. = to undo witchcraft.

35. = the mouth.

36. = evil?
11′ You fill his mouth with the water and [ … ] to [ … ].

12′ [Incantation: “I have eaten], River, I have drunk.” Incantation: “The h[oly] River ([am I]).”

13′ [Incantation: “Sulphur, daughter] of the great heaven, am I.” Incantation: “Sulphur, [sulphur].”

14′ [Incantation: “Sulphur], great daughter of Ea.” Incantation: “… [ … ].”

15′ [Incantation: “Pu[re sulphur], the atá’išu-plant, [the most holy] herb, am I.”

16′ [ … ] of sulphur … [ … ].

17′ [Incantation: “ … ] am I.” [ … ]

18′ [Its ritual:] kukru-plant, so[apwort … ].

19′ [Incantation: “kukru-plant, oh kukru-pla[n]t” … ]

Rev.? breaks.

Notes

obv.? 3′–6′: Apparently the fragmentary ll. 3′–5′ gave the full wording of the namerimburru:da incantation; if our restorations are correct, this is the only incantation that is fully quoted in the preserved parts of the tablet.

7′: For the phrase, which is not attested as the incipit of an incantation elsewhere, see e.g. Maqlû III 186, IV 149. The writing of kaššāpu and kaššāpu with simple Uš₃ is typical for second-millennium manuscripts and is found also in Neo-Assyrian copies of Middle Assyrian originals (e.g. KAL 2, 23 rev. 3′, 7′, 21′, see Abwehrzauber und Behexung, 20).

9′: For the incipit cf. Maqlû VII 55: EN at-ti-man-nu munus kaššāpu(Uš₁₁,ZU) ša ipuša(DU-sa) šal-mi, and also Maqlû V 48: EN at-ti-man-nu munus kaššāpu(Uš₁₁,ZU) ša te-neppuša(DU-DU-sa) (ritual tablet 75′: EN at-ta-man-nu munus kaššāpu(Uš₁₁,ZU) ša te-te-né-ep-pu-u(s)). The masculine form te-pu-[u] instead of the expected te-puš or te-pušinni is probably due to a corruption of the text.

11′: Apparently a Gtn form of še’û, as it is often found in anti-witchcraft incantations (cf. e.g. Maqlû I 18, II 206, 210, V 115, VI 48).

15′: Restore perhaps e-ll[e-ni-ti-ia … ] or similarly.
rev. 1’–8’: Only signs from the second half of the lines are preserved; the words that can be read suggest that we are not dealing with a continuous text, but with a series of incantation incipits whose application and purpose is summarized in l. 8’.

5’: The incipit is reminiscent of the incantation Ezzêtu Êamratu dannatunu gaššâtu in Maqlû V 132–41 (for this and related incantations see Abusch, MesWi, 158 n. 95).

6’: One expects tamiḫûja before tādirātûja, but the traces can hardly represent anything but -mûtu-ia. Perhaps a noun derived from damâmu “to wail” has to be restored?

9’: The incantation is known from Maqlû VIII; unfortunately the beginning of the text is only fragmentarily preserved also in Maqlû: EN pu-u id-bu-ub lem-na-ti pu-u im-ta-[l’-li lem-na-ti(??)] (VIII 96’–97’); in ritual tablet 169’: EN pu-i id-bu-ub lem-na-a-ši mish(šu) qâṭī(su)'. Therefore, the restoration of the second half of the line in our text must remain uncertain. The reading idîbub lemânti (and not idîbubùnti) is not beyond doubt either; none of the extant Maqlû manuscripts provides us with an unambiguous spelling.

12’: The first incipit is reminiscent of the incantation Id âkul alti in Maqlû VI 106ff. (ritual tablet 111’, see also VAT 11119 [KAR 269] obv. II 9). If the restoration is correct, it seems likely that this very incantation is referred to here, even if the word order of the first line is slightly altered. An incantation Id qašdu (anâku) is attested only here so far; for the motif of the pure river cf. especially Id ellu namru qudušu anâku in Maqlû III 61–76.

13’: The first incantation is probably to be identified with Kibrîtu elletu mârat šamē rûbiṭi anâku in Maqlû VI 69–77, even if the space available at the beginning of the line suggests that elletu was “omitted” in the present incipit. This incantation is immediately followed by Kibrîtu kibrîtu mârat Id in Maqlû VI 78–84, and we can confidently restore the second half of the line accordingly.

14’: The incipit in the first half of the line is unknown otherwise; but in view of the preceding incantations a restoration kibrîtu seems very likely. Apparently another incipit follows in the second half of the line. It seems that this section was not concluded by a rubric and/or a ritual instruction; note that the sulphur “theme” is continued in the next section.

15’: The incantation is probably to be identified with Kibrîtu elletu atâ’îsu šammu qudušu anâku in Maqlû VI 85–97. The traces at the beginning of
the line suggest a reading 'e[l-lu, which is difficult to reconcile with the feminine gender of kibrı́tu. For a similar mistake see the note on obv. 9'; cf. also fragmentary VAT 11119 (KAR 269) obv. II 4–5: e[kib-ri]-it kib-ri-it kib-ri-it [mārat ıd(?)], e[l]}-l]u7 kib-ri-it kal-la-at ıd[d] (coll.).

17: The sign preceding -ša-ku looks like šal or possibly tar; read perhaps [...] x qud-<du->ša-ku?

18: Maqlû ritual tablet 97 prescribes the use of kukru and maštakal for the recitation of the incantation Ēpiṣtu qumqummatu (VI 16–23).

19: The extreme uncertainty of the restoration, which is based on comparison with Maqlû VI 24ff. and 34ff., needs hardly to be stressed.
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